

Applicant: Ilkka Naatti et al.
Application No.: 10/561,401
Response to Office action mailed Mar. 20, 2008
Response filed June 11, 2008

Remarks

Claims 34–51 remain pending in the application. The claims previously presented have been canceled. In the Office action dated Mar. 20, 2008, claims 15–33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the term “travel direction” in claims 15 and 27 and the term “it” in claim 22. Claims 15–21, 25–28 and 30–31 were rejected as anticipated by Kinnunen et al. and claims 22–24 were rejected as obvious over Kinnunen et al. in view of Saukkonen. The specification was subjected to as containing various informalities and errors. The drawings were objected to “because ‘9’ and ‘10’ are shown in figure 1, but not discussed.”

The specification has been corrected in accordance with the examiner’s requirements. FIGS. 3–6 have been amended to add the call-out number 10 as shown in FIG. 2.

With respect to the required drawing changes, because 9 and 10 do not appear on FIG. 1 as filed the examiner’s meaning cannot be determined. It is noted that as a general rule not every appearance of a reference numeral must be described if the number is described with respect to another figure. See ¶ [0021] and ¶ [0024] for 9, and see ¶ [00251] for 10.

Applicant’s invention is a device for winding reels of paper on spools, such as can be used in a papermaking machine or other situation where a paper must be wound continuously. The invention is characterized by using an endless belt to form the nip where the web engages the forming reel of paper. Particularly the claimed invention is directed to the movement of a guide roll contained within the endless loop which moves, or is mounted for motion in a peripheral direction with respect to the circumference of the forming reel and against the incoming direction of the paper web. This arrangement has the advantage that the forming reel can be wound in the preliminary winding station while the axis of the reel spool remains stationary, and the nip hardness can be varied by placing guiding roll directly under the forming reel to form a hard nip, or to produce a softer nip the first guide roll can be moved in the peripheral direction with respect to the circumference of the forming reel and against the incoming direction.

The invention set forth in the new claims distinguishes over Kinnunen et al. inasmuch

Applicant: Ilkka Naatti et al.
Application No.: 10/561,401
Response to Office action mailed Mar. 20, 2008
Response filed June 11, 2008

as the axis of the first guide roll 10 of Kinnunen et al. does not move or is not mounted for motion, as required by claims 34 and 44 respectively.

The invention set forth in the new claim 34 distinguishes over Saukkonen because the roll 18 and the endless loop of Saukkonen is not arranged so that “the paper web first contacts the reel spool or machine reel while engaged with the endless loop”, and further it does not transfer “the machine reel away from the preliminary reeling station in the incoming direction in a transfer device mounted for motion in the incoming direction so that the machine reel continues to form the nip through which the paper web passes until reeling of the machine reel is finished” as claimed in claim 34. Similarly with respect to claim 44, in Saukkonen the endless belt does not form a nip with the reel spool where the paper web first engages the reel spool, and the transfer device 15 of Saukkonen does not read on the claimed transfer device, as the claimed device is arranged so that the reel spool remains in engagement with the endless loop.

The new claims distinguished over White WO 98/55384 inasmuch as the axis of the first guide roll 74 does not move or is not mounted for motion, as required by claims 34 and 44 respectively.

The new claims distinguish over Verajankorva EP 0 860 391 because “an axis defined by the first guide roll” does not move or is not mounted for motion “in the peripheral direction and against the incoming direction”.


The new claims distinguish over Aalto 6,382,550 because “an axis defined by the first guide roll” when moving in the peripheral direction does not move and is not mounted for motion “against the incoming direction of the web” rather it moves in the incoming direction.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant: Ilkka Naatti et al.
Application No.: 10/561,401
Response to Office action mailed Mar. 20, 2008
Response filed June 11, 2008

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance.
Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934
Attorney for Applicant
Stiennon & Stiennon
P.O. Box 1667
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667
(608) 250-4870
Amdt2.res

June 11, 2008 (2:55pm)